

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

On pages 2-4 of the Office Action, claims 314-316, 321, 325, 330, 336, 337, 356, 410, 443, 444, 446, 448, 449, 453, 455, 459, 462, 463, 465, and 466 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,219,183 to McKillip (the “McKillip patent”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,656,705 to Mallya, et al. (the “Mallya patent”).

On pages 4-6 of the Office Action, claims 324, 333, 335, 454, 460, and 461 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,407,718 to Popat, et al. (the “Popat patent”).

On pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action, claims 317, 318, 320, and 450-452 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,670,226 to Yoshizawa, et al. (the “Yoshizawa patent”).

On pages 7-9 of the Office Action, claims 326, 327, 456, and 457 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,704,317 to Hickenbotham, et al. (the “Hickenbotham patent”).

On pages 9 and 10 of the Office Action, claims 328 and 458 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,622,758 to Hollis, et al. (the “Hollis patent”).

On pages 10 and 11 of the Office Action, claims 338, 447, and 464 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,842,722 to Carlson (the “Carlson patent”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 314-318, 320, 321, 324-328, 330, 333, 335-338, 356, 410, and 443-466 for the reasons set forth below.

The Invention

Before addressing the specific claim limitations, it will be helpful first to briefly summarize the invention of the pending claims.

The present invention resides in a sheet of printable business cards including a paper cardstock sheet and a continuous liner sheet releasably secured to the paper cardstock sheet with ultraremovable adhesive. The sheet of printable business cards also includes continuous through-cut lines through the paper cardstock sheet but not through the continuous liner sheet. The continuous through-cut lines define, at least in part, perimeter edges of a printable business card in the paper cardstock sheet. The printable business card has a surface that is coupled to the ultraremovable adhesive. The printable business card is configured to be removed from the continuous liner sheet exposing the ultraremovable adhesive on the continuous liner sheet and the non-tacky printable business card's surface.

The present invention also resides in a sheet of printable business cards including a cardstock sheet and a continuous liner sheet releasably secured to the cardstock sheet with a layer of ultraremovable adhesive. The sheet of printable business cards also includes continuous through-cut lines through the cardstock sheet but not through the continuous liner sheet. The continuous through-cut lines define, at least in part, perimeter edges of a printable business card in the cardstock sheet. The printable business card has a surface that is coupled to the ultraremovable adhesive. The printable business card is configured to be removed from the continuous liner sheet exposing the ultraremovable adhesive on the continuous liner sheet and the non-tacky printable business card's surface.

Rejection of Claims 314-316, 321, 325, 330, 336, 337, 356, 410, 443, 444, 446, 448, 449, 453, 455, 459, 462, 463, 465, and 466 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon the McKillip Patent and the Mallya Patent

On pages 2-4 of the Office Action, claims 314-316, 321, 325, 330, 336, 337, 356, 410, 443, 444, 446, 448, 449, 453, 455, 459, 462, 463, 465, and 466 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of independent claims 314 and 443 and dependent claims 315, 316, 321, 325, 330, 336, 337, 356, 410, 444, 446, 448, 449, 453, 455, 459, 462, 463, 465, and 466.

As best understood by Applicants, on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner is apparently taking the position that the McKillip patent teaches the claimed sheet, except for the claimed ultraremovable adhesive. On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that “Mallya et al. teach an ultraremovable adhesive . . .” Additionally on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that “that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the suspension-polymer ultraremovable adhesive of Mallya et al. as the ultraremovable adhesive in McKillip in order to improve stability and the adhesive properties.” Emphasis added. For at least the reasons below, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s line of reasoning.

The McKillip patent teaches a printable sheet 10 having separable cards 12a and 12b. The printable sheet 10 of the McKillip patent includes a face sheet 14, a backing sheet 16, a layer of pressure-sensitive adhesive 18 disposed between face sheet 14 and backing sheet 16, and a coating of a release agent 20a disposed between face sheet 14 and adhesive 18 substantially only in regions in registration with cards 12a and 12b. The perimeters of cards 12a and 12b are defined by cut lines 32a and 32b that extend through face sheet 14. According to the McKillip patent, “an adhesive material is used that will form a substantially permanent bond . . .” See the McKillip patent at col. 3, lines 38-40.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that there would have been no reason for a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printable sheet of the McKillip patent by replacing the permanent pressure-sensitive adhesive taught by the McKillip patent with the ultraremovable adhesive taught by the Mallya patent to “improve . . . the adhesive properties.” As can be appreciated, if one were to replace the permanent pressure-sensitive adhesive of the McKillip patent with the ultraremovable adhesive of the Mallya patent, one could *not* achieve the desired permanent adhesion of the McKillip patent between the areas of face sheet 14 and backing sheet 16 that are not in registration with cards 12a and 12b, i.e., the adhesive properties *would not* be improved. Accordingly, the use of an ultraremovable adhesive to adhere face sheet 14 to backing sheet 16 is contrary to the teaching of the McKillip patent, and one of ordinary skill in the art *would not* have replaced a permanent adhesive with an ultraremovable adhesive to “improve . . . adhesive properties,” as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, for at least the above reason, this 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of independent claims 314 and 443 and dependent claims 315, 316, 321, 325, 330, 336, 337, 356, 410, 444, 446, 448, 449, 453, 455, 459, 462, 463, 465, and 466 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 324, 333, 335, 454, 460, and 461 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon the McKillip Patent, the Mallya Patent, and the Popat Patent

On pages 4-6 of the Office Action, claims 324, 333, 335, 454, 460, and 461 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent, and further in view of the Popat patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of dependent claims 324, 333, 335, 454, 460, and 461.

Dependent claims 324, 333, and 335 depend from independent claim 314, and dependent claims 454, 460, and 461 depend from independent claim 443. As described above, the combination of the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent is against the teachings of the McKillip patent. Accordingly, independent claims 314 and 443 are

patentable over the improper combination of the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent for at least the reason given above.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the Popat patent merely to disclose “continuous through-cut lines . . . for the purpose of forming individual structures [that] are removable and separate from each other . . .” The Popat patent teaches “substantially transparent paper labels . . .” See col. 1, lines 5-6, of the Popat patent. In col. 3, lines 22-34, the Popat patent teaches “[a]dhesive layer 42 has two important characteristics . . . the adhesive must be able to withstand the high heat levels generated inside a xerographic printer . . . [and] adhesive layer 42 must also be clear.” There is *no* teaching in the Popat patent to replace a permanent adhesive with an ultraremovable adhesive. Thus, the Popat patent *fails* to overcome the explicit teaching of the McKillip patent that “an adhesive material is used that will form a substantially permanent bond . . .” See the McKillip patent at col. 3, lines 38-40. Accordingly, the combination of the McKillip patent and the Popat patent, and the combination of the McKillip patent, the Mallya patent, and the Popat patent is improper.

The Mallya patent “relates to the production of inherently tacky, elastomeric pressure-sensitive adhesive microsphere useful in the production of removable and repositionable note paper, tape and label products.” See col. 1, lines 4-7, of the Mallya patent. However, the Mallya patent *fails* to teach any specific note paper, tape, or label products.

As discussed above, the Popat patent teaches “substantially transparent paper labels . . .” See col. 1, lines 5-6, of the Popat patent. Additionally, in col. 2, line 67 to col. 3, line 1, the Popat patent teaches “[e]ach label is provided with an adhesive layer 30 which permits the user to apply the label to another surface.”

Accordingly, *neither* the Mallya patent, *nor* the Popat patent, *nor* the combination of the Mallya patent and the Popat patent teaches or suggests “the printable business card is configured to be removed from the continuous liner sheet exposing the ultraremovable

adhesive on the continuous liner sheet and the non-tacky printable business card's surface," as required by independent claims 314 and 443.

For at least the above reasons, this §103 rejection of dependent claims 324, 333, 335, 454, 460, and 461, each of which depend from patentable independent claim 314 or 443, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 317, 318, 320, and 450-452 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon the McKillip Patent, the Mallya Patent, and the Yoshizawa Patent

On pages 6-7 of the Office Action, claims 317, 318, 320, and 450-452 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent, and further in view of the Yoshizawa patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of dependent claims 317, 318, 320, and 450-452.

Dependent claims 317, 318, and 320 depend from independent claim 314, and dependent claims 450-452 depend from independent claim 443. As described above, the combination of the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent is against the teachings of the McKillip patent. Accordingly, independent claims 314 and 443 are patentable over the improper combination of the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent for at least the reasons given above.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the Yoshizawa patent merely to "disclose[s] a primer coat comprising a polyvinyl alcohol-based primer with silicate . . ." The Yoshizawa patent is "related to a removable adhesive sheet to be used . . . as a label for process control or a price label and, in particular . . . an index label . . ." See col. 1, lines 4-7, of the Yoshizawa patent. Also in col. 1, lines 11-12, the Yoshizawa patent teaches "[a]dhesive sheets, as processed into labels, seals, stickers and emblems . . ." Additionally, in col. 1, lines 33-39, the Yoshizawa patent teaches "[r]emovable sheets are used . . . as price labels . . . [s]uch labels are fundamentally required to have good removability such that when they are eventually peeled off, they can easily be removed . . ." There is *no* teaching in the Yoshizawa patent to replace a

permanent adhesive with a removable adhesive, much less to replace a permanent adhesive with an ultraremovable adhesive. Thus, the Yoshizawa patent *fails* to overcome the explicit teaching of McKillip patent that “an adhesive material is used that will form a substantially permanent bond . . .” See the McKillip patent at col. 3, lines 38-40. Accordingly, the combination of the McKillip patent and the Yoshizawa patent, and the combination of the McKillip patent, the Mallya patent, and the Yoshizawa patent is improper.

As discussed above, the Mallya patent “relates to the production of inherently tacky, elastomeric pressure-sensitive adhesive microsphere useful in the production of removable and repositionable note paper, tape and label products.” See col. 1, lines 4-7, of the Mallya patent. However, the Mallya patent *fails* to teach any specific note paper, tape, or label products.

Also as discussed above, in col. 1, lines 11-12, the Yoshizawa patent teaches “[a]dhesive sheets, as processed into labels, seals, stickers and emblems . . .” However, the Yoshizawa patent *fails* to teach any specific adhesive sheet processed into labels, seals, stickers, or emblems.

Accordingly, *neither* the Mallya patent, *nor* the Yoshizawa patent, *nor* the combination of the Mallya patent and the Yoshizawa patent teaches or suggests:

a [paper] cardstock sheet; a continuous liner sheet releasably secured to the [paper] cardstock sheet with [a layer of] ultraremovable adhesive; continuous through-cut lines through the [paper] cardstock sheet but not through the continuous liner sheet; and the continuous through-cut lines defining at least in part perimeter edges of a printable business card in the [paper] cardstock sheet; wherein: the printable business card has a surface that is coupled to the ultraremovable adhesive, and the printable business card is configured to be removed from the continuous liner sheet exposing the ultraremovable adhesive on the continuous liner sheet and the non-tacky printable business card's surface.

as required by independent claims 314 and 443.

For at least the above reasons, this § 103 rejection of dependent claims 317, 318, 320, and 450-452, each of which depend from patentable independent claim 314 or 433, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 326, 327, 456, and 457 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon the McKillip Patent, the Mallya Patent, and the Hickenbotham Patent

On pages 7-9 of the Office Action, claims 326, 327, 456, and 457 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent, and further in view of the Hickenbotham patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of dependent claims 326, 327, 456, and 457.

Dependent claims 326 and 327 depend from independent claim 314, and dependent claims 456 and 457 depend from independent claim 443. As described above, the combination of the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent is against the teachings of the McKillip patent. Accordingly, independent claims 314 and 443 are patentable over the improper combination of the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent for at least the reasons given above.

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the Hickenbotham patent merely to “teach crushing the corner of label stock for use in printers or copier[s] . . .” The Hickenbotham patent is related to “the problem of dispensing relatively stiff sheetstock from a corner nip feeder.” See col. 1, lines 12-13, of the Hickenbotham patent. In col. 5, lines 32-35, the Hickenbotham patent teaches a “sheetstock . . . consisting of a carrier web . . . to which is releasably adhered a facestock 32 including an underlying pressure-sensitive adhesive layer . . .” The Hickenbotham patent *fails* to teach any specific type of adhesive, much less teach replacing a permanent adhesive with an ultraremovable adhesive. Thus, the Hickenbotham patent *fails* to overcome the explicit teaching of McKillip patent that “an adhesive material is used that will form a substantially permanent bond . . .” See the McKillip patent at col. 3, lines 38-40.

Accordingly, the combination of the McKillip patent and the Hickenbotham patent, and the combination of the McKillip patent, the Mallya patent, and the Hickenbotham patent is improper.

As discussed above, the Mallya patent “relates to the production of inherently tacky, elastomeric pressure-sensitive adhesive microsphere useful in the production of removable and repositionable note paper, tape and label products.” See col. 1, lines 4-7, of the Mallya patent. However, the Mallya patent *fails* to teach any specific note paper, tape, or label products.

Also as discussed above, in col. 5, lines 32-35, the Hickenbotham patent teaches a “sheetstock . . . consisting of a carrier web . . . to which is releasably adhered a facestock 32 including an underlying pressure-sensitive adhesive layer . . .” In col. 6, lines 42-43, the Hickenbotham patent teaches “[t]he labelstock was die-cut through the facestock to form 21 individual labels . . .”

Accordingly, *neither* the Mallya patent, *nor* the Hickenbotham patent, *nor* the combination of the Mallya patent and the Hickenbotham patent teaches or suggests “the printable business card is configured to be removed from the continuous liner sheet exposing the ultraremovable adhesive on the continuous liner sheet and the non-tacky printable business card’s surface,” as required by independent claims 314 and 443.

For at least the above reasons, this § 103 rejection of dependent claims 326, 327, 456, and 457, each of which depend from patentable independent claim 314 or 443, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 328 and 458 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon the McKillip Patent, the Mallya Patent, and the Hollis Patent

On pages 9 and 10 of the Office Action, claims 328 and 458 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent, and further in view of the Hollis patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of dependent claims 328 and 458.

Dependent claim 328 depends from independent claim 314, and dependent claim 458 depends from independent claim 443. As described above, the combination of the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent is against the teachings of the McKillip patent. Accordingly, independent claims 314 and 443 are patentable over the improper combination of the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent for at least the reasons given above.

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the Hollis patent merely to disclose that “[t]he backing sheet has a leading edge and a trailing edge that extends out to form a narrow exposed strip extending the entire width of the liner sheet . . .” The Hollis patent “pertains to filing systems, and more particularly to apparatus that facilitates storing and retrieving documents.” The Hollis patent teaches labels with pressure sensitive labels (see, for example, col. 2, lines 33-34; and col. 6, lines 5-6 and lines 9-11 of the Hollis patent), however, the Hollis patent *fails* to teach any specific type of adhesive. Thus, the Hollis patent *fails* to overcome the explicit teaching of McKillip patent that “an adhesive material is used that will form a substantially permanent bond . . .” See the McKillip patent at col. 3, lines 38-40. Accordingly, the combination of the McKillip patent and the Hollis patent, and the combination of the McKillip patent, the Mallya patent, and the Hollis patent is improper.

As discussed above, the Mallya patent “relates to the production of inherently tacky, elastomeric pressure-sensitive adhesive microsphere useful in the production of removable and repositionable note paper, tape and label products.” See col. 1, lines 4-7, of the Mallya patent. However, the Mallya patent *fails* to teach any specific note paper, tape, or label products.

Also as discussed above, the Hollis patent teaches labels with pressure sensitive labels (see, for example, col. 2, lines 33-34; and col. 6, lines 5-6 and lines 9-11 of the Hollis patent). In col. 5, line 65-67, the Hollis patent teaches a “label sheet 23 is comprised of a flexible but sturdy backing sheet . . . and one or more labels . . .” to col.

6, line 20. Furthermore, in col. 6, lines 7-8, the Hollis patent teaches “[t]he labels 3A-3G are affixed to the backing sheet 25 at regular intervals . . .”

Accordingly, *neither* the Mallya patent, *nor* the Hollis patent, *nor* the combination of the Mallya patent and the Hollis patent teaches or suggests:

a [paper] cardstock sheet; a continuous liner sheet releasably secured to the [paper] cardstock sheet with [a layer of] ultraremovable adhesive; continuous through-cut lines through the [paper] cardstock sheet but not through the continuous liner sheet; and the continuous through-cut lines defining at least in part perimeter edges of a printable business card in the [paper] cardstock sheet; wherein: the printable business card has a surface that is coupled to the ultraremovable adhesive, and the printable business card is configured to be removed from the continuous liner sheet exposing the ultraremovable adhesive on the continuous liner sheet and the non-tacky printable business card's surface.

as required by independent claims 314 and 443.

For at least the above reasons, this § 103 rejection of dependent claims 328 and 458, each of which depend from patentable independent claim 314 or 443, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 338, 447, and 464 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon the McKillip Patent, the Mallya Patent, and the Carlson Patent

On pages 10 and 11 of the Office Action, claims 338, 447, and 464 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent, and further in view of the Carlson patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of dependent claims 338, 447, and 464.

Dependent claim 338 depends from independent claim 314, and dependent claims 447 and 464 depend from independent claim 443. As described above, the combination of the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent is against the teachings of the McKillip

patent. Accordingly, independent claims 314 and 443 are patentable over the improper combination of the McKillip patent and the Mallya patent for at least the reasons given above.

On page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the Carlson patent merely to disclose “a printable laminate . . . includes die cut cards, which are coated with an ink receptive coating . . .” In col. 7, lines 35-39, the Carlson patent teaches “[t]he invention is directed to sheetstock that employ laminates added to a core sheet material with either one or more scab sheets superimposed on the top of the core sheet to offset the difference in thickness of a laminate providing functionally equivalent thicknesses . . .” In col. 15, lines 35-36, the Carlson patent teaches that “[s]cab sheet 50 could be attached with releasable or non-releasable adhesives . . .” Also in col. 15, lines 60-61, the Carlson patent teaches that “[the bottom scab sheet] may be adhered with a releasable adhesive or permanent adhesive 32.” However, the Carlson patent *fails* to teach replacing a permanent adhesive with an ultraremovable adhesive. Thus, the Carlson patent *fails* to overcome the explicit teaching of McKillip patent that “an adhesive material is used that will form a substantially permanent bond . . .” See the McKillip patent at col. 3, lines 38-40. Accordingly, the combination of the McKillip patent and the Carlson patent, and the combination of the McKillip patent, the Mallya patent, and the Carlson patent is improper.

As discussed above, the Mallya patent “relates to the production of inherently tacky, elastomeric pressure-sensitive adhesive microsphere useful in the production of removable and repositionable note paper, tape and label products.” See col. 1, lines 4-7, of the Mallya patent. However, the Mallya patent *fails* to teach any specific note paper, tape, or label products.

Regarding the Carlson patent, in col. 13, lines 29-32, the Carlson patent teaches “[w]ith reference to the Figures it will be seen that sheetstock 10 is formed from a page of paper 12 to which a top layer of plastic 16 is laminated or otherwise adhered by adhesive 18.” Emphasis added. Also in col. 13, at lines 48-52, the Carlson patent

teaches “cards 20 are formed in the plastic/paper composite by die cutting the sheetstock . . . [s]uch die cuts . . . include a combination of cuts and ties that allow the card 20 to remain together and affixed to the sheetstock . . .” Emphasis added. Thus, the die cuts taught by the Carlson patent are through all the layers of sheetstock, and the cards are held in place by ties. The Carlson patent does *not* teach a business card attached to a liner sheet.

Accordingly, *neither* the Mallya patent, *nor* the Carlson patent, *nor* the combination of the Mallya patent and the Carlson patent teaches or suggests “continuous through-cut lines through the [paper] cardstock sheet but not through the continuous liner sheet . . . and the printable business card is configured to be removed from the continuous liner sheet exposing the ultraremovable adhesive on the continuous liner sheet and the non-tacky printable business card’s surface,” as required by independent claims 314 and 443.

Therefore, based at least on the above arguments, dependent claims 338, 447, and 464, each of which depend from independent claim 314 or 433, are patentable the combination of the McKillip patent, the Mallya patent, and the Carlson patent. For at least the above reasons, this § 103 rejection of dependent claims 338, 447, and 464, each of which depend from patentable independent claim 314 or 443, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants believe the arguments set forth above place this application in condition for allowance. An early notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application not in condition for a notice of allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned practitioner at the telephone number listed below to discuss steps to place the application into condition for allowance. No fees are believed due in association with the filing of this Response. In the event of a payment deficiency, or if additional fees are due, please charge the fees to Avery Dennison’s Deposit Account No. 013025.

Appl. No. 09/872,353
Response dated October 18, 2011
Reply to Office Action of April 21, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
AVERY DENNISON CORPORATION

Dated: October 18, 2011 By: /Ronald Ugolick - Reg. No. 57,080/
Ronald Ugolick - Reg. No. 57,080

Customer No. 63543
Avery Dennison Corporation
Law Department
150 North Orange Grove Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91103
Phone (714) 674-8128; Fax (626) 304-2251